

REMARKS

This Amendment, submitted in response to the Office Action January 10, 2005, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 remain pending in the application. Claims 1, 5, 9, and 13-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (JP 2001-266321, hereafter "AAPA"). Claims 2, 6 and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Albrecht (U.S.P. 5,689,384). Claims 3, 7 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Richard (U.S.P. 4,426,047). Claims 4, 8 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Albrecht and further in view of Richard. Applicant respectfully submits the following arguments in traversal of the prior art rejections.

Applicant's invention relates to a servo detection apparatus that is able to provide accurate detection in a time-efficient manner. Conventional servo tracking devices, such as that described by JP 2001-266321 (the AAPA), displace a servo-tracking reproducing head in a width-wise direction of a tape with the reciprocation movement of the tape. However, it is not possible to detect servo defects in all areas when the head is narrower than a servo track because the reproducing head will scan not all areas of the track.

Applicant's invention, illustrated by example, in Fig. 4, includes multiple reproducing heads SH disposed in a width direction of a servo track. As shown in Fig. 5, the heads become

vibrated along a width direction of a servo track. The meandering of the heads along the tape width results in reading of servo signals scattered in many areas of the servo track.

The Examiner contends that the AAPA teaches each feature of claim 1. However, claim 1 describes a head-controlling unit that vibrates in a range of a width of a servo track. The Examiner generally relies on paragraphs 13 and 24 of the AAPA to teach features of the claim. However, as best understood, the AAPA only describes movement of the reproducing transducer in a width direction, but not a vibration along the width as claimed. Simple movement does not necessarily correspond to a vibratory movement. Moreover, as presented in the discussion of the AAPA in the specification, the AAPA has deficiencies by leaving large portions of a servo unscanned, thereby having relatively poor servo tracking performance in comparison to the claimed device. Therefore, claim 1 and all its dependent claims are patentable for at least these reasons.

Applicant submits that the secondary references of Albrecht and Richard do not make up for the deficiencies of the AAPA.

With further regard to claim 2, this claim describes multiple reproducing heads for one servo track. The Examiner cites Albrecht for teaching this feature. However, Albrecht teaches multiple heads for multiple servo tracks rather than multiple heads for one servo track as described by claim 2. Therefore, claim 2 and its dependent claims 4, 6, 8, 10 and 12 are patentable for this additional reason. Richard does not make up for the above deficiencies of Albrecht.

Applicant adds claims 16-19 to describe the invention more particularly.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No.: 10/687,696

In view of the above, Applicant submits that claims 1-19 are in condition for allowance. Therefore it is respectfully requested that the subject application be passed to issue at the earliest possible time.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER


Susan Perng Pan
Registration No. 41,239

Date: April 11, 2005